[redacted]

From: DevelopmentControl
Sent: 15 April 2025 23:17
To: DevelopmentControl
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 25/00573/PIP

Categories: [redacted]

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 15/04/2025 11:16 PM from [redacted].

Application Summary

Address:	Land South Of Agricultural Buildings Manor Farm Molesworth Road Old Weston
Proposal:	Permission in principle for residential development for up to 9 dwellings
Case Officer:	Marie Roseaman

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	[redacted]
Email:	[redacted]
Address:	Benfield House Brington Road Old Weston Huntingdon

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	The development site is not linked to the village by a footpath. Access to the rest of the village would mean walking on the main road. Coupled with the bend and the drop of the road coming into the village, that creates a dangerous situation. The lack of footpath also means that all access would have to be by vehicle, in which case the properties could not really be said to be a part of the village at all Many drivers speed through the village. Others do not slow down until they have passed the crossroads and are into what they perceive as the main residential area of the village. Traffic through the village increases massively as soon as there is any problem with the A14, with many drivers looking for back roads, unfamiliar with village layouts and speed limits. Flooding has increased at the lower end of the village in recent years, with the junction seen on the location plan flooding on several occasions. The drainage system has already collapsed

under its current load and can not handle more.

The application states that "the scale of the development would be sustainably located for future occupants to meet many of their day-to-day needs" and refers to the Village Hall and the Swan. That would be fair, provided that the future occupants are undemanding folk whose "day-to-day needs" are met by a dog-training class, a cooked breakfast every 3 months and a pint twice a week when the pub is actually open. This is simply not a valid statement. This also negates the comment in section 7.3 about additional spending supporting the vitality of the settlement.

Fitting 9 properties on a small piece of land, presumably all with multi-car parking, would mean that these properties would be densely packed, totally out of character with the rest of the village. Their disconnection from the rest of the village means that they would be better placed elsewhere, where there is better scope for them to be properly incorporated in a community.

Kind regards